ATTORNEY DOCKET NO: 71665

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant	: PERINI
Serial No	: 10/524,001
Confirm. No	: 9459
Filed	: February 8, 2005
For	: APPARATUS FOR...
Art Unit	: 3724
Examiner	: ALIE, GHASSEM
Dated	: September 15, 2008

Hon. Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPEAL BRIEF

(1) REAL PARTY IN INTEREST.

The real party in interest is Fabio Perini.

(2) RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES.

There are believed to be no related appeals or interferences.

(3) STATUS OF CLAIMS.

Claims 1, 3-6, 25 and 26 are on appeal.

Claims 12-24 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 2 and 7-11 have been canceled.

Claims 1, 3-6, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gambaro et al. (U.S. 2002/0121170) in view of Nystrand (U.S. 3,905,260) and in further view of Friden (U.S. 2,047,021).

Claims 1, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nystrand in view of Friden.

(4) STATUS OF AMENDMENTS.

Appellant has not filed an Amendment After Final Rejection. As such, an Amendment After Final Rejection has not been entered.

(5) SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

CLAIM 1:

The present invention relates to an apparatus for producing small paper rolls (page 1, lines 7-8). Appellant has discovered that conventional techniques of cutting logs produces cut logs that have ends that are oblique with respect to their longitudinal axis and lack uniformity such that the cut logs are never the same in length. The fact that the cut logs, produced by conventional techniques, do not have the same length disadvantageously requires that the cut logs be trimmed again. This disadvantageously wastes time and produces a significant amount of waste. The present invention overcomes these disadvantages and problems and produces paper rolls that are uniform in length, which do not need to be trimmed again. This advantageously decreases product waste and provides for a more efficient process of producing

the rolls.

The apparatus of the present invention comprises a rewinding machine R (page 6, line 4; Figures 1-4). The rewinding machine R produces elongated paper rolls 2 (page 6, lines 4, page 8, lines 10-14; Figures 1-4). The apparatus further comprises a trimming device D (page 6, lines 2-3; Figures 1-4, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E and 5F). The trimming device D trims at least one end of each roll 2 produced by the rewinding machine R such that trimmed rolls 2' are formed (page 6, lines 10-11; page 10, lines 7-9). A trimmed roll store element M receives the trimmed rolls 2' from the trimming device D (page 8, line 15 through page 9, line 2; Figures 1-2). The trimmed roll store element M stores the trimmed rolls 2' (page 8, line 15 through page 9, line 2). The apparatus also comprises a cutting-off machine T (page 8, line 15 through page 9, line 2; Figures 1 and 2). The trimmed roll store element M supplies the trimmed rolls 2' to the cutting-off machine T (page 8, line 15 through page 9, line 2; Figures 1 and 2). The cutting-off machine subdivides the trimmed rolls 2' into a plurality of small rolls (page 8, line 15 through page 9, line 2).

CLAIM 3:

The trimming device D may further comprise an entry section 1 for the entry of the rolls 2 to be trimmed (page 6, lines 8-9; Figures 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E and 5F). The trimming device D may comprise an exit section 7 for the exit of the trimmed rolls (page 6, line 12; Figures 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E and 5F) and a trimming station with trimming means 60 (35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph) for trimming the rolls 2 (page 7, lines 9-11; Figures 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E and 5F).

The trimming device D may further comprise a roll moving means 3 (35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph) for moving the rolls 2, 2' between the entry section 1, the trimming station and the exit section 7 (page 6, lines 5-7, Figures 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E and 5F). The trimming device D may also comprise a log retaining means 4 (35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph), associated with the roll moving means 3, for retaining the rolls 2, 2' when the rolls 2, 2' are subjected to movement (page 6, lines 5-7; Figures 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E and 5F).

CLAIM 4:

The log retaining means 4 may be grippers for clamping the paper rolls 2, 2' (page 7, lines 2-8; Figures 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E and 5F).

CLAIM 5:

The grippers may be associated with the means for moving the rolls 3 (page 7, lines 5-7; Figures 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E and 5F).

CLAIM 6:

The trimming device D may include a means 5 (35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph) for transferring the rolls 2, 2' from the entry section 1 to the means for moving the rolls 3 (page 6, lines 8-9; Figures 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E and 5F). The means 5 for transferring the rolls may be disposed between the section for the entry 1 and the means for moving the rolls 3 (page 6, lines 8-9; Figures 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E and 5F). The means 5 for transferring the rolls may comprise

a body 52 (page 6, lines 13-19; Figure 5A). The body 52 may be mounted on a shaft 51 (page 6, lines 13-19; Figure 5A) that is parallel to the rolls 2 which enter the entry section 1 (Figure 5A). The body 52 may have a plurality of seats 50 (page 6, lines 13-19; Figure 5A).

CLAIM 25:

The trimming device D may be located upstream of the trimmed log store element M (page 8, line 15 through page 9, line 2; Figures 1 and 2).

CLAIM 26:

The cutting-off machine T may be located downstream of the trimmed log store element M (page 8, line 15 through page 9, line 2; Figures 1 and 2). The cutting-off machine T may be located downstream of the trimming device D (page 8, line 15 through page 9, line 2; Figures 1 and 2).

(6) GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL.

Whether claims 1, 3-6, 25 and 26 are rejectable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gambaro et al. in view of Nystrand and in further view of Friden.

Whether claims 1, 25 and 26 are rejectable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nystrand in view of Friden.

(7) ARGUMENT.

ISSUE: Whether claims 1, 3-6, 25 and 26 are rejectable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gambaro et al. in view of Nystrand and in further view of Friden.

The present invention relates to an apparatus for producing small paper rolls. The apparatus comprises a rewinding device, a trimming device, a trimmed roll storing element and a cutting-off machine. The trimming device receives uncut paper logs from the rewinding machine and trims at least one end of the uncut paper logs to form trimmed paper logs. The trimmed paper logs are then received by the trimmed roll storing element. The trimmed roll storing element transfers the cut logs to the cutting machine. The cutting machine cuts the trimmed logs into smaller logs. Appellant has discovered that conventional trimming techniques disadvantageously produce a lot of waste since the rolls are cut such that the length of the rolls are never the same. The disadvantageously requires that each roll be cut again to make the rolls have a uniform length. This significantly increases operating costs since a large amount of the paper log is wasted. The present invention advantageously solves the problem of producing paper rolls that are of non-uniform length. The small rolls produced by the cutting-off machine provide the result that no trim has to be cut since the logs fed to the machines are already trimmed by the trimming device. This significantly reduces the amount of production waste since the rolls fed to the cutting-off machine already have the desired constant dimensions. Further, it advantageously reduces collection and disposal time of trimmed pieces since the production of the trimmed pieces are all located in the trimming device and trimmed pieces are not located in multiple devices. This significantly reduces production costs.

These features and cost saving advantages are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art as a whole, including Gambaro et al., Nystrand and Friden. The references as a whole fail to teach and fail to suggest the combination of features as claimed. The prior art fails to suggest the novel combination of a trimming device that trims uncut paper logs which are then stored in a trimmed log storing unit and are supplied to a cutting machine that cuts the trimmed logs into specific lengths to form a plurality of small rolls. This advantageously simplifies and improves the log-cutting process by significantly reducing paper waste. This advantageously provides an apparatus that is cost-effective and reliable.

Gambaro et al. discloses an apparatus 1 that cuts entire logs 20 of substrate into individual logs 22. Logs are delivered into a distribution sprocket 10 and are transported in a direction perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the log. The pockets 14 in the distribution sprocket are shaped to hold logs during the cutting operation without the need to use a secondary clamping device. A log which is nested into the sprocket is supported along its entire length and rotated into a cutting area 80 where it is divided into rolls by a cutting device,. The divided log is rotated past the cutting area, and the individual rolls are secured in the pockets by a roll retention device 24. The retention device prevents the rolls from leaving the pockets until the desired roll exit point 56 is reached. Unwinding and scuffing of the rolls is also prevented by the retention device. The rolls are deposited on a diverter 34 which then delivers the rolls to an index conveyor 33 for further processing.

Gambaro et al. fails to teach and fails to suggest the combination of a cutting-off machine that receives rolls from a trimmed roll store element wherein at least one end of each

roll supplied by the trimmed roll store element is cut by a trimming device. At most, Gambaro et al. discloses apparatus 1 that cuts an entire log 20 of substrate into individual logs 22. However, Gambaro et al. does not teach or suggest that the apparatus 1 receives precut rolls that are cut by a trimming device. Compared with Gambaro et al., the cutting-off machine receives rolls that have at least one end cut by a trimming device. This is significant in the present invention because it advantageously produces rolls of uniform length and significantly reduces the amount of product waste produced when cutting the rolls. Gambaro et al. fails to disclose such uniform roll cutting advantages since Gambaro does not direct the person of ordinary skill in the art toward a cutting-off machine that receives trimmed logs. As such, the prior art as a whole fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness as the prior art as a whole does not disclose important features of the claimed combination.

Nystrand discloses a saw infeed conveyor 20. The infeed conveyor 20 receives the output of a rewinder and takes the logs directly from the rewinder. Pusher means 21 are supported on the frame 22 of the conveyor 20 to intermittently move the logs from the conveyor 20 onto a roll down table 23. The roll down table 23 is an inclined plane and is equipped with a sensing device 24 which senses the presence of a sufficient accumulation of logs so as to prevent the further operation of the pusher 21. Logs are transferred to a log transfer unit 25, which is made up of a plurality of bucket conveyors 26. The bucket conveyors are supported between spaced apart endless chains so as to move in a loop. In one part of the loop the buckets receive a log and thereafter move along in an essentially horizontal path to dump the logs into the lanes 27 for transfer to the log saw 28. The log saw 28 transversely cuts

the logs.

Nystrand fails to teach or suggest the combination of a cutting-off machine that receives trimmed rolls that are cut by a trimming device. Nystrand merely discloses logs that are received from a rewinder and are cut by a log saw 28, but there is no teaching or suggestion in the Nystrand disclosure that the logs are trimmed before being cut by the log saw 28. In contrast to Nystrand, the trimming device of the present invention receives logs from a rewinder and cuts at least one end of each log before the cut log is stored in a trimmed log store element. According to the present invention, the trimmed logs are transferred from the trimmed log store element to the cutting-off machine such that the trimmed logs are subdivided by the cutting-off machine. This significantly reduces manufacturing costs since logs of uniform length are created which do not have to be cut again, which advantageously reduces the amount of paper waste produced. Compared with the present invention, Nystrand merely suggests elongated logs that are transversely cut by an orbital saw. However, Nystrand fails to provide any teaching or suggestion that would direct the person of ordinary skill in the art toward cutting the rolls and transferring the cut logs to the orbital saw to be cut again as claimed. As such, the prior art as a whole fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed combination. Accordingly, the prior art as a whole fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness since the prior art as a whole does not direct the person of ordinary skill in the art toward supplying trimmed rolls to a cutting-off machine as featured in the present invention.

Friden discloses a machine including a mechanism 6 for feeding the units of work to a trimming mechanism, which includes a belt conveyor 7. Along the sides of the belt conveyor

7 are guide plates 8 for preventing the units 9, fed by the belt, from rolling off. Circular saws 50, 51 trim ends off the units while they are held in a wheel as the wheel revolves.

Friden fails to provide any suggestion or teaching for the combination of a storing element that receives trimmed logs from a trimming device wherein the trimmed roll store element supplies the trimmed logs to a cutting machine. Friden merely discloses a trimmer, but fails to provide any teaching for modifying the apparatus of Gambaro et al. Gambaro et al. already discloses a cutting machine that provides for both cutting and trimming of paper logs. As such, Gambaro et al. does not require a separate trimming device. The person of ordinary skill in the art would not be directed to combine the teachings of Friden and Gambaro et al. since Gambaro et al. excludes the use of a separate trimmer since the apparatus of Gambaro et al. already has paper log trimming features. The references as a whole fail to provide any suggestion of using the teachings of Friden and Nystrand to modify the apparatus of Gambaro et al. The references as a whole do not teach and do not suggest the combination of two separate cutting machines wherein the trimmed logs from one cutting machine is supplied to the other cutting machine by a trimmed log storing unit. As such, the prior art references as a whole takes a different approach and does not teach or suggest the features of the claimed combination.

CLAIM 3

The references as a whole fail to teach or suggest the combination of a trimming device

that trims at least one end of each roll, wherein the trimmed rolls are stored in a trimmed roll store element that supplies the trimmed logs to a cutting-off machine. At most, Gambaro et al., Nystrand and Friden teach cutting whole logs, but none of the cited references suggests subdividing already trimmed logs as claimed. In fact, there is absolutely no teaching in Gambaro et al. that would suggest to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the infeed conveyor 12 of Gambaro et al. receives logs having at least one end cut by a trimming device. As such, the prior art as a whole takes a very different approach and fails to disclose important features of the claimed combination. Accordingly, the prior art as a whole fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness as the prior art as a whole does not direct the person of ordinary skill in the art toward each feature of the present invention.

CLAIM 4

As noted in the final rejection, neither Gambaro et al. nor Nystrand teaches or suggests the combination of a log retaining means that are grippers for clamping the rolls. The Office Action states that Friden discloses grippers for clamping rolls. Appellant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation. Friden must be given a fair reading for what it teaches. Friden merely discloses a wheel 21 that has notches or serrations 22 formed around its circumference between teeth 26', which are adapted to receive tubular members to be trimmed. However, Friden fails to provide any teaching or suggestion that the serrations 22 clamp the tubular members as claimed. In contrast to the present invention, Friden only discloses that the serrations 22 receive the tubular members such that the tubular members are prevented from angling, but fails

to disclose that the serrations 22 provide any clamping action as featured in the present invention. Compared with Friden, the grippers of the present invention clamp the rolls. This advantageously secures the rolls such that the rolls do not move. This is significant in the present invention because it provides for a more accurate cut of the rolls. This advantageously allows at least one end of each roll to be cut perpendicularly so that each roll is of a uniform length. Friden fails to disclose such accurate roll cutting advantages since the serrations 22 of Friden merely receive the tubular members, but do not clamp the members as featured in the present invention. As such, the prior art as a whole fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness as the prior art as a whole does not teach or suggest important features of the claimed combination.

CLAIM 5

Friden fails to disclose a gripper for clamping the rolls as claimed. Friden merely discloses a wheel 21 that has notches or serrations 22 formed around its circumference between teeth 26', which are adapted to receive tubular members to be trimmed. However, Friden fails to provide any teaching or suggestion that the serrations 22 provide any clamping action for retaining the tubular members as claimed. In contrast to the present invention, Friden only discloses that the serrations 22 receive the tubular members such that the tubular members are prevented from angling, but fails to disclose that the serrations 22 provide any clamping action as featured in the present invention. Compared with Friden, the grippers of the present invention clamp the rolls. This advantageously allows rolls of various widths to be secured such

that the rolls do not move when they are transferred. This is significant in the present invention because it provides for a more accurate cut of the rolls. This advantageously allows at least one end of each roll to be cut perpendicularly so that each roll is of a uniform length. Friden fails to disclose such accurate roll cutting advantages since the serrations 22 of Friden merely receive the tubular members, but do not clamp the members as featured in the present invention. This disadvantageously requires that each serration be located at a spaced location from an adjacent serration wherein the space between each serration must be equal to or less than a width of a roll to be cut. This disadvantageously does not allow the serrations to receive members of varying width. As such, the prior art as a whole takes a different approach and fails to teach or suggest important features of the claimed combination.

CLAIM 6

Friden fails to teach or suggest the combination of a means for transferring rolls that comprises a body wherein the body is mounted on a shaft parallel to the rolls which enter an entry section of a trimming device. At most, Friden discloses a flight of inclined steps 11 which aids in aligning the units 9 as they are fed to the trimmer. The units 9 are supported through arm 6'. However, the inclined steps of Friden are not mounted on a shaft that is parallel to the rolls which enter an entry section of the trimmer as claimed. As clearly shown in Figure 1 of Friden, there is no shaft that is parallel to an entry section of the trimmer. As such, the prior art as a whole fails to disclose important features of the present invention. Accordingly, the prior art as a whole does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness as the prior art as a

whole does not direct the person of ordinary skill in the art toward each feature of the present invention.

CLAIM 25

The Office Action takes the position that Gambaro et al. discloses a trimming device that is located upstream of a trimmed log store element and a cutting-off machine that is located downstream of the trimmed log store. Appellant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation. Gambaro et al. must be given a fair reading for what it teaches. A fair reading of Gambaro et al. discloses that the infeed conveyor 12 does not store or receive trimmed logs as claimed. In contrast to Gambaro et al., the trimmed log store element of the present invention supplies a cutting-off machine with pre-trimmed logs. This advantageously reduces collection and disposal time of trimmed pieces since the production of the trimmed pieces are all located in the trimming device and not in multiple devices. Gambaro et al. does not disclose such efficiency advantages since Gambaro et al. is completely void of a trimmed log store element that stores pre-trimmed logs. Compared with the present invention, Gambaro et al. clearly teaches that the infeed conveyor 12 supplies whole logs to a trimming device, but the infeed conveyor 12 does not supply the trimming device with pre-trimmed logs as featured in the claimed combination. Accordingly, the prior art as a whole does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness since the prior art as a whole does not direct the person of ordinary skill toward each feature of the present invention.

CLAIM 26

Gambaro et al. fails to teach or suggest the combination of a trimmed log store element that stores trimmed logs and feeds trimmed logs to a cutting-off machine. Gambaro et al. merely discloses an infeed conveyor 12 that supplies non-precut logs to a trimming device. However, there is no suggestion or teaching in Gambaro et al. that would direct the person of ordinary skill in the art toward feeding pre-trimmed logs to a trimming device via the infeed conveyor 12. As such, it is Appellant's position that the infeed conveyor 12 is not the equivalent of a trimmed log store element as featured in the present invention. Accordingly, the prior art as a whole fails to direct the person of ordinary skill in the art toward each feature of the claimed combination.

Conclusion

The prior art does not teach and does not suggest the combination of features claimed. The prior art directs the person of ordinary skill in the art toward structures which are dissimilar to the claimed structure. Each of the references teach in a direction away from the combination claimed. The references do not render the claimed subject matter obvious. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection be reversed and that the claims be indicated to patentably define over the prior art.

ISSUE: Whether claims 1, 25 and 26 are rejectable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nystrand in view of Friden.

CLAIM 1

Nystrand fails to teach or suggest a cutting-off machine that receives already trimmed paper logs from a trimmed paper log storing unit. Nystrand merely discloses a sawing system for transversely cutting logs of wound paper along four lanes of a conveyor belt. However, Nystrand does not direct the person of ordinary skill in the art toward supplying the orbital saw with precut rolls as claimed. At most, Nystrand discloses a bucket conveyor for receiving elongated logs and dumping the elongated logs into four lanes wherein the logs are advanced toward an orbital saw in a sequential manner. Nystrand clearly does not disclose that the orbital saw receives pre-trimmed logs, which are pre-trimmed by a trimming device, from a storing unit. In fact, Nystrand provides no suggestion for a trimming device that trims at least one end of a paper log to form a plurality of trimmed paper logs. Nystrand fails to appreciate the problem that the present invention solves. Instead of being concerned with maintaining a uniform length of rolls produced by a cutting-off machine, Nystrand is concerned with the problem with advancing logs for cutting in such a way that bottlenecking of the cut pieces on a conveyor belt is avoided. Nystrand fails to disclose two separate cutting machines wherein the logs from one cutting machine are supplied to the other cutting machine by a trimmed log storing unit. Nystrand only suggests cutting logs of wound paper and subdividing them into small rolls with just one orbital saw. As such, Nystrand directs the person of ordinary skill in the art away from the features of the claimed combination and does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness as the reference fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed combination.

Friden fails to provide any suggestion or teaching for the combination of a storing element that receives trimmed logs from a trimming device and supplies the trimmed logs to a cutting machine. Friden merely discloses a trimmer, but fails to provide any teaching for modifying the apparatus of Nystrand. Nystrand already teaches an orbital saw that cuts paper logs. As such, Nystrand does not require a separate trimming device. The person of ordinary skill in the art would not be directed to combine the teachings of Friden and Nystrand since Nystrand excludes the use of a separate trimmer since the apparatus of Nystrand already has paper log trimming features. The references as a whole fail to provide any suggestion of using the teachings of Friden to modify the apparatus of Nystrand. The references as a whole do not teach and do not suggest the combination of two separate cutting machines wherein the trimmed logs from one cutting machine is supplied to the other cutting machine by a trimmed log storing unit. As such, the prior art references as a whole takes a different approach and does not teach or suggest the features of the claimed combination. Accordingly, the references as a whole fail to establish a prima facie case of obviousness since the references as a whole fail to teach or suggest the combination of supplying precut logs to a cutting-off machine as claimed.

CLAIM 25

The Office Action takes the position that Nystrand discloses a trimming device that is located upstream of a trimmed log store element and a cutting-off machine that is located

downstream of the trimmed log store. Appellant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation. Nystrand must be given a fair reading for what it teaches. A fair reading of Nystrand discloses that there is no trimmed log store element as claimed. In contrast to Nystrand, the trimmed log store element of the present invention supplies a cutting-off machine with pre-trimmed logs. This advantageously reduces collection and disposal time of trimmed pieces since the production of the trimmed pieces are all located in the trimming device and not in multiple devices. Nystrand does not disclose such efficiency advantages since Nystrand is completely void of a trimmed log store element that stores pre-trimmed logs. Compared with the present invention, Nystrand discloses an orbital saw that transversely cuts a plurality of logs, but Nystrand is completely void of a trimmed log store element that stores pre-trimmed logs as featured in the claimed combination. Accordingly, the prior art as a whole does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness since the prior art as a whole does not direct the person of ordinary skill toward each feature of the present invention.

CLAIM 26

Nystrand fails to teach or suggest the combination of a trimmed log store element that stores trimmed logs and feeds trimmed logs to a cutting-off machine. Nystrand merely discloses a rewinder that feeds a plurality of logs to an orbital saw such that the logs are cut in a transverse direction. However, there is no suggestion or teaching in Nystrand that would direct the person of ordinary skill in the art toward feeding pre-trimmed logs to a trimming device via a trimmed log store element as claimed. Nystrand fails to disclose a trimmed store element that

stores trimmed logs. In fact, Nystrand fails to provide any suggestion or teaching for feeding pre-trimmed logs to the orbital saw as featured in the claimed combination. As such, it is Appellant's position that Nystrand does not disclose any component that can be considered the equivalent of a trimmed log store element as featured in the present invention. Accordingly, the prior art as a whole fails to direct the person of ordinary skill in the art toward each feature of the claimed combination.

Conclusion

The prior art does not teach and does not suggest the combination of features claimed. The prior art directs the person of ordinary skill in the art toward structures which are dissimilar

to the claimed structure. Each of the references teach in a direction away from the combination claimed. The references do not render the claimed subject matter obvious. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection be reversed and that the claims be indicated to patentably define over the prior art.

Respectfully submitted
for Appellant,

By:_____
John James McGlew
Registration No. 31,903
McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.

JJM:BMD
71665-14

DATED: September 15, 2008
SCARBOROUGH STATION
SCARBOROUGH, NEW YORK 10510-0827
(914) 941-5600

SHOULD ANY OTHER FEE BE REQUIRED, THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE IS HEREBY REQUESTED TO CHARGE SUCH FEE TO OUR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT 13-0410.

(8) CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. An apparatus for producing small paper rolls, the apparatus comprising:

a rewinding machine, said rewinding machine producing elongated paper rolls;

a trimming device, said trimming device trimming at least one end of each roll produced by said rewinding machine to form trimmed rolls;

a trimmed roll store element, said trimmed roll store element receiving said trimmed rolls from said trimming device, said trimmed roll store element storing the trimmed rolls;

a cutting-off machine, said trimmed roll store element supplying said trimmed rolls to said cutting-off machine, said cutting-off machine subdividing the trimmed rolls into a plurality of small rolls.

3. An apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said trimming device further comprises:

an entry section for the entry of the rolls to be trimmed;

an exit section for the exit of the trimmed rolls;

a trimming station with trimming means for trimming the rolls;

a roll moving means for moving the rolls between said entry section, said trimming station and said exit section;

a log retaining means, associated with said roll-moving means, for retaining the rolls when subjected to said movement.

4. An apparatus according to claim 3, wherein said log retaining means are grippers for clamping said paper rolls.

5. An apparatus according to claim 3, wherein said grippers are associated with said means for moving the rolls.

6. An apparatus according to claim 3, wherein said trimming device includes a means for transferring the rolls from the entry section to said means for moving the rolls, said means for transferring the rolls being disposed between said section for the entry and said means for moving the rolls, said means for transferring the rolls comprising a body, said body being mounted on a shaft parallel to the rolls which enter said entry section, said body having a plurality of seats.

25. An apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said trimming device is located upstream of said trimmed log store element.

26. An apparatus according to claim 25, wherein said cutting-off machine is located downstream of said trimmed log store element, said cutting-off machine being located downstream of said trimming device.

(9) Evidence appendix

NONE

(10) Related proceedings appendix

NONE